



March 8, 2004

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, DC 20231

10/015,054

RECEIVED
MAR 23 2004
TC 2600

2645

UT
4/14

PROTEST UNDER 37 CFR 1.291(a)

Re: Method of displaying advertisement on display of mobile communication terminal

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2004

US File # 20020072353 Filed: 12/11/2001

Technology Center 2600

Sirs:

Recently I found the above referenced patent filing and believe this filing has NOT issued in the U.S. The US File # is 20020072353

I am voicing an objection as a concerned third party and as a U.S. Citizen. The patent filing describes at great length an advertising delivery system dependent upon a database maintained at the client level in a client-server ad delivery system. The appropriate ads are selected through profiling techniques at the server level then a database is created and downloaded via wireless Internet network (0007) to a "mobile communication terminal" that delivers advertising. Downloads of advertisements are performed through wireless internet communications.

The relevant Claims presented are Claims 1, 2, 3.

The "vehicle display" client-server system is described in (0007) (0028). Clearly, a plurality of advertisements and a corresponding database of display triggers are loaded to the client mobile processor. The ads are displayed

Consistently, the inventor describes the invention in internet terms (0028) ... because it is simply an extension of an electronic communications network like the internet and specifically relating to advertising delivery. The ads are then delivered for display to the vehicle display consequential to the voluntary actions of the vehicle, the driver, the programmer or all.

This is referred to as "pull" advertising as a voluntary action on the part of a user interacts with a pre-established database and a targeted ad is displayed.

I am objecting to this patent filing as it is neither novel nor unique. It is of particular note that no prior art was submitted with this filing and only some vague references to server and user supplied profiling systems. The filers are correct that a targeted system based on URLs or keywords is more accurate and

excels in its ability to deliver "relevant" ads at the exact moment of interest. However, the filers did not include the following references:

1. US Patent 6,141,010 ... similar technology
2. Gator.com (recently changed to Claria.com) has been marketing such a system since 1998 or 1999
3. WO9955066 (A1) or EP1076983 (A1) ... similar technology
4. U.S. Publication 20020009978 ... similar technology

There may be more prior art preceding the 12/11/2001 filing.

I believe the Examiner should look very closely at the Claim made and judge accordingly.





